

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT  
DIVISION FOUR

In re J.G., a Person Coming Under the  
Juvenile Court Law.

ALAMEDA COUNTY SOCIAL  
SERVICES AGENCY,

Petitioner and Respondent,

v.

J.G.,

Objector and Appellant.

A133866, A135151, & A135696

(Alameda County  
Super. Ct. No. HJ11016655)

**INTRODUCTION**

J.G. (Mother) filed these three appeals from several orders issued by the dependency court. By orders dated June 25 and August 8, 2012, this court ordered the three appeals consolidated. In numerical order, the first appeal<sup>1</sup> (No. A133866) timely challenges orders of the dependency court dated October 12, 2011, setting a contested six-month review hearing, and granting the foster parents' request to take the minor on a cruise. The second appeal (No. A135151) timely challenges a March 1, 2012<sup>2</sup> order

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition to these three consolidated appeals, this court considered a prior appeal filed by Mother herself without the assistance of counsel. This appeal subsequently was dismissed after Mother's counsel filed a no issues statement. (*In re J.G.* (Dec. 12, 2011, A131841) [nonpub. opn.].)

<sup>2</sup> All further dates are in the calendar year 2012 unless otherwise indicated.

continuing the dependency court's jurisdiction and setting a hearing terminating Mother's parental rights pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 366.26 (.26 Hearing), and an April 5 order appointing a guardian ad litem for Mother. The third appeal (No. A135696) timely challenges: (1) an April 24 order identifying adoption as the goal for the minor and continuing the .26 Hearing; (2) an April 26 order denying Mother's petition to modify or to terminate the dependency court's jurisdiction over the minor; and (3) a June 4 order continuing the .26 Hearing.

On September 10, Mother's appointed appellate counsel filed a no issues statement in accordance with *In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952 (*Sade C.*), stating that he had reviewed the record, discussed the case both with Mother's trial counsel and with staff at the First District Appellate Project, and found no arguable issues to raise on appeal that would advance Mother's interests in this case. Counsel's declaration states further that Mother has been notified of counsel's intention to file a no issues statement, that Mother was informed that she was entitled to review immediately counsel's copy of the record below, and that Mother may be permitted to file a letter with this court suggesting errors made by the trial court entitling Mother to relief.

Mother was then advised by the clerk of this court, by letter dated September 12, that she could "file a letter stating issues you feel should be reviewed on appeal," and that if she did not do so by October 12, her appeal would be dismissed. The clerk's letter also advised appellant that if she did file a letter, it would "be forwarded to the Court for determination as to whether your attorney should be directed to brief any or all issues outlined in your letter," and that if the Court decided "to direct your attorney to provide further briefing, a letter will issue from this Court," but if not, the appeal would be dismissed.

On September 19, this court received a handwritten, one and one-half page letter from Mother dated September 16, suggesting a number of "Relevant Concerns," and "Legal" and "Additional Issues," Mother believed this court should review on appeal.

## **DISCUSSION**

The juvenile court's decision is presumed correct unless appellant can affirmatively establish that the trial court committed prejudicial error. (*Sade C., supra*, 13 Cal.4th at p. 994.) "An appealed-from judgment or order is presumed correct. [Citation.] Hence, the appellant must make a challenge. In so doing, [s]he must raise claims of reversible error or other defect [citation], and 'present argument and authority on each point made' [citations]. If [s]he does not, [s]he may, in the court's discretion, be deemed to have abandoned [her] appeal. [Citation.] In that event, it may order dismissal. [Citation.] Such a result is appropriate here. With no error or other defect claimed against the orders appealed from, [we are] presented with no reason to proceed to the merits of any unraised 'points'—and, a fortiori, no reason to reverse or even modify the order[ ] in question. [Citation.]" (*Ibid.*, fn. omitted)

Having reviewed Mother's letter brief, we conclude no arguable issues have been raised regarding the orders from which Mother timely appealed. Mother's letter brief makes numerous conclusory statements, but none of them appear to be factual and are not supported by any references to the trial court record. Moreover, the letter brief does not provide any reasoned argument or authority showing that any of the trial court's procedural or substantive rulings, as to matters properly within the scope of these consolidated appeals, constituted reversible error.

Having found no cognizable claim of trial court error in Mother's letter brief, we conclude Mother has implicitly abandoned her appeals. Accordingly, as permitted by *Sade C., supra*, 13 Cal.4th 952, we shall dismiss them.

## **DISPOSITION**

These appeals are hereby DISMISSED, and this decision is final immediately.

---

RUVOLO, P. J.

We concur:

---

REARDON, J.

---

BASKIN, J.\*

---

\* Judge of the Contra Costa County Superior Court assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.